

REMARKS

The Examiner's action, the references cited therein and the Examiner's comments in paragraph 9 at pages 9 and 10 of the office action have been carefully considered and the application has been amended accordingly. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on December 10, 2008 with undersigned counsel during which the Examiner's comments at paragraph 9 of the office action were discussed and it was agreed that the amendments proposed herein by applicant to claims 1 and 8 clarified the distinction between applicant's invention and applicant's claims, as argued in the prior Amendment filed on August 15, 2008.

Claims 1 and 8 (inadvertently indicated as claim 9 by the Examiner) stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Rabne et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,332). Claims 2-5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne et al in view of Kamperman et al.

The present invention provides a conditional access component that includes several software items, each referred to as a conditional access system and each being directed to a particular access system. According to the present invention several conditional access systems are stored in a single conditional access component, whereby the user, upon acquiring a license for a particular provider's content, can selectively enable that provider's conditional access system in the conditional access component. The primary feature of the present invention is that the several conditional access systems are preloaded in the conditional access component, but are disabled, and do not become activated until the end-user elects to activate any particular system by paying the necessary license fee and acquiring the required license.


Rejected claim 1 now recites that the plurality of particular conditional access systems are preloaded onto the conditional access component at the same time that the generic system is loaded onto the component and the particular conditional access systems are initially disabled, the component is provided to an end-user, the particular preloaded conditional access system to be used is identified, a license is acquired for the identified preloaded conditional access system, the license is loaded into the component and the identified preloaded conditional access system is enabled after successful verification of the license. Rejected claim 8 recites a conditional access component having a first software module

embedding a basic functionality common to a plurality of preloaded different conditional access systems, a plurality of specific application software of which each constitutes a particular conditional access system in conjunction with the basic functionality, a non-volatile memory for storing the plurality of specific application software, the particular preloaded conditional access systems being initially disabled in the non-volatile memory, means for acquiring a license for the particular preloaded conditional access system, and means for selectively enabling the particular preloaded conditional access system subject to a successful verification of the corresponding license.

The Examiner agrees that all of the elements of claims 1 and 8 are not disclosed by Rabne et al. Specifically Rabne et al fails to disclose a preloaded conditional access component that contains **initially** all variations of the future functionalities, wherein the preloaded systems are disabled until a purchase action, such as acquiring a license, is performed and wherein means are provided for selectively enabling at least one of the preloaded systems subject to successful verification of the license. Moreover, the disclosure of Kamperman does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rabne et al. Specifically, Kamperman et al does not disclose preloading software access systems in a conditional access component, which systems are disabled when installed, and which may be selectively enabled by the end user by acquiring a license, which is verified by the system. Accordingly, no combination of Rabne et al and Kamperman et al can be seen to render unpatentable this inventive aspect of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejections of remaining claims 1 and 8, and claims 2-5 and 10 dependent therefrom, should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An early Notice of Allowance directed to remaining claims 1-5, 8 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Stuart J. Friedman
Registration No. 24,312

28930 Ridge Road
Mt. Airy, MD 21771
Telephone: (301) 829-1003